## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

| EUGENE ANDREWS (K-56087),                   | ) |                    |
|---|---|--------------------|
|   | ) |                    |
| Plaintiff,                                  | ) |                    |
|   | ) |                    |
| v.  | ) | Case No. 16 C 7671 |
|   | ) |                    |
| CARRIE ANDERSON, Officer of the             | ) |                    |
| Administrative Review Board Office, et al., | ) |                    |
|   | ) |                    |
| Defendants.                                 | ) |                    |

## **MEMORANDUM ORDER**

Pro se prisoner plaintiff Eugene Andrews ("Andrews") has taken an appeal from what he has mistakenly described as this Court's August 16, 2017 order of dismissal of this action (in fact, the memorandum order of dismissal was entered on August 21). This Court has printed out copies of Andrews' self-prepared appeal documents and, most importantly for present purposes, a copy of our Court of Appeals' September 29, 2017 "PLRA Fee Notice and Order," which concluded with these paragraphs:

Further, this appeal is subject to the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that all other proceedings in this appeal are **SUSPENDED** pending the assessment and payment of any necessary fees. See Newlin v. Helman, 123 F.3d 429, 434 (7th Cir. 1997). The court will take no further action in this action under the fee statement is resolved.

Neither party should tender any brief or motion that is not related to appellant's fee status on appeal. Appellee is under no obligation either to file a brief or to respond to any such motion filed by appellant. Any motion not related to appellant's fee status will be deemed denied without further court action.

Regrettably this Court lacks any supporting legal staff, and nearly all of its calendar has been reassigned to its colleagues under the District Court's computer-driven random assignment system. Because it cannot now be determined what the outcome of the Court of Appeals'

September 29 order will be, and because this Court lacks the resources to deal with the matter in any event, this Court recommends to the Executive Committee that all future proceedings in this action be reassigned to another judge on this District Court under the same computer-generated

random assignment system.

Willan D Shaden

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

\_ ....

Date: October 10, 2017

- 2 -